UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,730	12/04/2003	Daniel J. Daily	4366-149	1751

48500   7590   12/23/2008
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.
1560 BROADWAY, SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER
PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2436	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 October 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,8-12 and 14-31* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5-7 and 13* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/27/2008*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/16/2008 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 is attached to this office action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Additionally, Examiner respectfully requests Applicant's attention to item # **3**, for objected claims 5, 6, 7 and 13 and further requests amending these claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claims 5, 6, 7 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1 – 4, 8 – 12 and 14 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Garvin (U.S. Publication Number 2004/0010780).

5.   As per Claim 1, Garvin teaches "a plurality of parsers operable to parse an input stream,

each parser corresponding to a unique input structure (Fig.1 #10, 12, 14, 18, 36; paragraph

[0035 – 0036 and 0058];

        a parser selection agent operable to receive the input stream and select a subset of the

plurality of parsers to parse the input stream, wherein the input stream comprises a plurality of

differing input structures and wherein the selected subset of parsers produce multiple parser

outputs corresponding to the plurality of differing input structures (paragraph [0047 – 0048]; and

        an encoding agent operable to convert the multiple parser outputs to a common

grammar (Paragraph [0048])".

6.   As per Claim 8, Garvin teaches "(a) receiving an input stream, the input stream

comprising information defined by at least first and second input structures; (b) providing at least

a portion of the input stream to each of a plurality of parsers, the plurality of parsers

corresponding to differing sets of grammars; (c) receiving output from each of plurality of

parsers (Paragraph [0035 – 0036 and 0058]); and

        (d) based on the outputs of the plurality of parsers, performing at least one of: (i)

selecting a firstOutput from a first parser that corresponds to the first input structure and a

second output from a second parser that corresponds to the second input structure; and (ii)

selecting a first parser corresponding to the first input structure to parse one or more first

segments of the input stream and a second parser corresponding to the second input structure

to parse one or more second segments of the input stream (paragraph [0047 – 0048)".

7.   As per Claim 23, Garvin teaches "receiving a stream of information, the stream being generated by one of a plurality of possible different computational sources, wherein each computational source generates a stream corresponding to a unique input structure and wherein each of a plurality of differently structured segments of the stream is free of an embedded tag indicating a corresponding computational source and/or input structure for the respective segment; comparing at least a portion of the stream with a set of tokens to provide a subset of tokens identified in the at least a portion of the stream (Paragraph [0035 – 0036; 0047 – 0048 and 0058]),

heuristically identifying, from among at least one of a plurality of possible input structures and a plurality of possible computational sources, at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0048]), and

parsing the stream based on the identified at least one of an input structure and computational source (paragraph [0048])".

8.   As per Claim 28, Garvin teaches "an input operable to receive a stream of information, the stream being generated by one of a plurality of possible different computational sources, wherein each computational source generates a stream corresponding to a unique input structure, and a parser operable to (a) compare at least a portion of the stream with a set of tokens to provide a subset of tokens identified in the at least a portion of the stream (Paragraph [0035 – 0036 and 0058]);

(b)heuristically identify, from among at least one of a plurality of possible input structures and a plurality of possible computational sources, at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0047 – 0048]); and

(c) parse the stream based on the identified at least one of an input structure and computational source, wherein the parser is not provided with an input structure identifier, other than the corresponding input structure itself, either in or external to the at least a portion of the input stream to identify or assist in the identification of the at least one of the respective input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of the stream and a computational source for at least a portion of the stream (paragraph [0048])".

9.   As per Claim 2, Garvin teaches "wherein the multiple parser outputs correspond to differing grammars (Paragraph [0058 and 0061])".

10.   As per Claim 3, Garvin teaches "wherein the parser selection agent and plurality of parsers are configured in a factory pattern and wherein the input stream comprises a plurality of messages having a plurality of headers comprising differing types of information (Paragraph [0061])".

11.   As per Claim 4, Garvin teaches, "wherein the parser selection agent is operable to provide to a client, in response to a parse request, at least one of a parser output and an indication when at least some of the input stream is not successfully parsed and wherein the parser selection agent, prior to selection of the subset of parsers, is not informed in advance of the source or input structure associated with the at least some of the input stream (Paragraph [0060 – 0061])".

12.   As per Claim 9, Garvin teaches "wherein substep d(i) is performed (Paragraph [0047])".

13.   As per Claim 10, Garvin teaches "wherein substep d(ii) is performed (Paragraph [0048])".

14.   As per Claim 11, Garvin teaches "wherein the input stream comprises a plurality of nonstandardized headers (Paragraph [0052])".

15.   As per Claim 12, Garvin teaches "identifying one or more tokens in the input stream; and based on the identified one or more tokens, selecting the at least one of a plurality of parsers (Paragraph [00436, 0058 and 0061)".

16.   As per Claim 16, Garvin teaches "wherein the first parser produces a first output and the first output is a parse tree and further comprising: recursively evaluating at least some of the nodes in the parse tree to identify nodes requiting additional parsing (Paragraph [0055])".

17.   As per Claim 17, Garvin teaches "wherein the first parser produces a first output and the first output is a parse tree and further comprising: recursively examining at least some of the nodes in the parse tree to identify nodes of interest to a client (Paragraph [0047 – 0048])".

18.   As per Claim 18, Garvin teaches "wherein the first parser produces a first output and the first output is a parse tree and wherein at least first and second nodes of the parse tree have differing formats and further comprising: iteratively traversing a plurality of the nodes of the parse tree to locate nodes of interest, the nodes of interest comprising the first and second nodes; and converting each of the located nodes of interest to a standard format (Paragraph [0047 – 0048 and 0055])".

19.   As per Claim 20, Garvin teaches "wherein each of the plurality of parsers corresponds to a unique set of tokens and grammar rules (Paragraph [0058 and 0061])".

20.   As per Claim 21, Garvin teaches "wherein each of the plurality of parsers corresponds to a unique set of attribute grammars (Paragraph [0058 and 0061])".

21.   As per Claim 22, Garvin teaches "A computer readable medium containing processor executable instructions to perform the steps of Claim 8 (Paragraph [0081])".

22.   As per Claim 24, Garvin teaches "wherein in the input stream comprises a plurality of headers, wherein the headers comprise differing types of information, wherein each of the tokens has a corresponding method expressing a set of syntactical and/or semantical

relationships relating to the respective token and wherein the heuristically identifying step

comprises: for each token in the subset of tokens, invoking a corresponding method (paragraph

[0058, 0062 and 0066])".

23.   As per Claim 26, Garvin teaches "herein a parser performing the steps of Claim 20 is not

provided, by another computational entity, with a flag external to the input stream to identify or

assist in the identification of the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a

portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream

(paragraph [0065])".

24.   As per Claim 27, Garvin teaches "A computer readable medium containing processor

executable instructions to perform the steps of Claim 23 (paragraph [0081])".

25.   As per Claim 29, Garvin teaches "wherein each of the tokens has a corresponding

parser expressing a set of syntactical and/or semantical relationships relating to the respective

token and wherein the parser is further operable, for each token in the subset of tokens, to (d) to

invoke a corresponding method (paragraph [0058, 0062 and 0066])".

26.   As per Claim 31, Garvin teaches "wherein the parser is not provided, by another

computational component, with a flag external to the input stream to identify or assist in the

identification of the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a portion of

the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream (paragraph

[0065])".

27.   As per Claim 7, Garvin teaches "wherein the first and second fault information uses

different characters to refer to a same type of event and the encoding agent is further operable

to convert the different characters to a common set of characters to refer to the event

(paragraph [0025])".

28.   As per Claim 14, Garvin teaches "wherein a third parser successfully parses a first

portion of the input stream to form a third output and the first parser successfully parses the first

portion of the input stream to form a first output and further comprising: determining which of the

first and third outputs most likely corresponds to the first portion (paragraph [0047 – 0048])".

29.   As per Claim 19, Garvin teaches "wherein each of the first and second nodes use

different characters to refer to a same type of event and further comprising: converting the

characters in the first and second nodes to a common set of characters to refer to the type of

event (paragraph [0025])".

30.   As per Claim 25, Garvin teaches "wherein the comparing and heuristically identifying

steps are performed using a declarative programming approach rather than a procedural

programming approach, wherein the headers are nonstandardized, and wherein the invoking

step comprises setting a set of flags a corresponding set of values depending on the presence

or absence of a syntactical and/or semantical relationship; and wherein the values of the flags

are used to heuristically identify the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at

least a portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream

(paragraph [0058, 0062 and 0066])".

31.   As per Claim 30, Garvin teaches "wherein the parser is further operable to (e) assign, by

an invoked method, a set of flags a corresponding set of values depending on the presence or

absence of a syntactical and/or semantical relationship, wherein the values of the flags are used

to heuristically identify the at least one of an input structure corresponding to the at least a

portion of the stream and a computational source for the at least a portion of the stream

(paragraph [0058, 0062 and 0066])".

32. As per Claim 15, Garvin teaches, "wherein the determining step is performed using a least squares fit analysis and wherein step (d) is performed using a declarative programming rather than procedural programming approach(paragraph [0016 and 0049])".

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the disclosing in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially disclosing all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. If applicants are aware of any better prior art than those are cited, they are required to bring the prior art to the attention of the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PRAMILA PARTHASARATHY whose telephone number is (571)272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. to 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Pramila Parthasarathy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436
December 19, 2008